This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

GENERAL LIBRARY
OF
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PRESENTED BY
Dr. S. A. Green
26 Jan 1891

HF
175
.W

337.3
W18

From Dr. S. A. Green
Jan. 26, 1891

THE MORAL ASPECT

OF A

PROTECTIVE TARIFF,

How it Helps the

Wage Worker and Farmer.

An Address delivered before the Massachusetts Club

by J. H. WALKER.

35-956

THE MORAL ASPECT

OF A

PROTECTIVE TARIFF,

How it Helps the

Wage Worker and Farmer.

An Address delivered before the Massachusetts Club

by J. H. WALKER.

WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS:
Press of L. P. Goddard, No. 425 Main Street.
1888.

Address.

Before I proceed with the discussion I wish to present a few facts agreed upon by both sides.

All agree that wages are nominally and actually lower, as compared with American wages, in each of the following European countries, in the order named: Italy, Germany, Belgium, France, England.

In view of the difficulty of individual investigation and agreement, it is only fair that all disputants accept the rate of wages given in the United States or Massachusetts Reports for the different countries. I have taken the highest rate for each country given by either report, and I find the following yearly earnings. A family of four persons average to furnish two wage workers.

The total possible earnings of a man and woman in each country, in eight occupations, are as follows:

TRADES.		AMERICA.	ENGLAND.	FRANCE.	BELGIUM.	GERMANY.
CARPENTERS	Man,	$700 00	$383 00	$310 00	$203 50	$205 50
	Woman,	300 00—1000 00	153 20— 536 20	124 00— 434 00	81 40— 284 90	82 20— 287 70
	Supplies,	216 00	206 00	206 00	206 00	206 00
	Possible Savings,	784 00	330 20	228 00	78 90	81 70
LABORERS Common	Man,	450 00	235 00	188 50	150 00	155 50
	Woman,	300 00— 750 00	94 00— 329 00	75 40— 263 90	60 00— 210 00	62 20— 217 70
	Supplies,	216 00	206 00	206 00	206 00	206 00
	Possible Savings,	534 00	123 00	57 90	4 00	11 70
BLACKSMITHS	Man,	650 00	368 50	290 00	269 00	200 00
	Woman,	300 00— 950 00	147 40— 515 90	116 20— 406 20	107 60— 376 60	80 00— 280 00
	Supplies,	216 00	206 00	206 00	206 00	206 00
	Possible Savings,	734 00	309 90	200 20	170 60	74 00
LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS	Man,	1250 00	456 00	516 00	460 00	468 81
	Woman,	300 00—1550 00	182 40— 638 40	206 40— 722 40	184 00— 644 00	187 52— 656 33
	Supplies,	216 00	206 00	206 00	206 00	206 00
	Possible Savings,	1334 00	432 40	516 40	438 00	450 33
LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN	Man,	750 00	255 00	342 00	317 50	321 35
	Woman,	300 00—1050 00	102 00— 357 00	136 80— 478 80	127 00— 444 50	128 54— 449 89
	Supplies,	216 00	206 00	206 00	206 00	206 00
	Possible Savings,	834 00	151 00	272 80	238 50	243 89
TINSMITHS	Man,	550 00	325 00	273 00	220 00	177 50
	Woman,	300 00— 850 00	130 00— 455 00	109 20— 382 20	88 00— 308 00	71 00— 248 50
	Supplies,	216 00	206 00	206 00	206 00	206 00
	Possible Savings,	634 00	249 00	176 20	102 00	42 50
TANNERS	Man,	450 00	350 00	347 00	258 00	210 50
	Woman,	300 00— 750 00	140 00— 490 00	138 80— 485 80	103 20— 361 20	84 20— 294 70
	Supplies,	216 00	206 00	206 00	206 00	206 00
	Possible Savings,	534 00	284 00	279 80	155 20	88 70
WEAVERS	Man,	500 00	350 00	250 00	197 50	139 50
	Woman,	300 00— 800 00	140 00— 490 00	100 00— 350 00	79 00— 276 50	55 80— 195 80
	Supplies,	216 00	206 00	206 00	206 00	206 00
	Possible Savings,	584 00	284 00	144 00	70 50	*minus*

I also give a table of things (or their equivalent) absolutely necessary for the animal existence of a family of four persons in good health.

Yearly Cost of Supplies for a Family in New England of four persons at the lowest point.

Supplies.		1885. Price.	Total.
Flour,	3 bbls.	$7 00	$21 00
Corn Meal,	150 lbs.	025	3 75
Granulated Sugar,	150 "	075	11 25
Fresh Beef,	200 "	12	24 00
Corned Beef,	100 "	10	10 00
Pork,	100 "	10	10 00
Lard,	24 "	10	2 40
Ham,	16 "	115	1 84
Codfish,	100 "	08	8 00
Tea,	12 "	55	6 60
Butter,	75 "	23	17 25
Cheese,	10 "	14	1 40
Coal,	4 tons,	6 50	26 00
Beans,	1 bush.,	3 00	3 00
Potatoes,	12 "	80	9 60
Shoes,	4 pairs,	1 125	4 50
Cotton Cloth,	20 yards,	065	1 30
Prints,	20 "	055	1 10
Denims,	5 "	125	625
Satinets,	12 "	375	4 50
Town Rent,		4 00	48 00
			$216 11

These prices are too high for to-day, but whatever reduction is made from American retail prices, the same reduction must be made for Europe.

Of course, things other than the twenty-one named are used in the humblest family, but they take the place of, or the price of them is saved, by using less of the things named.

Of the twenty-one things, twelve are constantly exported, as is such leather as is used in common shoes, and are cheaper here than elsewhere, and all of them are about the same in price in every country in Europe. There is no duty on tea, and rents do not vary materially.

The prices and quality of rooms vary much more here than in Europe, going much higher and much lower here, according to locality, but the average is about the same.

That leaves seven things, that the free trader may fairly claim, cost more money in New England than in Europe.

	In New England.	In Europe.
Sugar,	$11 25	$ 7 25
Coal,	26 00	22 00
Shoes,	4 50	3 90
Cotton Cloths,	1 30	1 10
Prints,	1 10	90
Denims,	63	58
Satinets,	4 50	3 66
	$49 28	$39 39
Less cost in Europe,		9 89
		$49 28

Ten dollars a year is a liberal allowance for the difference, taking the known prices in the two countries, and two-fifths of that is in sugar. Even taking the false assumption of the free traders, that they cost here the European prices plus the tariff, it would be less than $14, for a family of four persons.

I have used every precaution known to me to make these figures reliable as a basis for a comparison. Of course in the fluctuation of prices, they are only true for the day they were made.

This table shows that a laborer's family of four persons, with two workers, cannot possibly save in Germany over $11.70; in Belgium, $4.00; in France, $57.90; in England, $123.00; in America $534.00, in a whole year.

A weaver's family can save in Germany nothing; in Belgium, $70.50; in France, $144.00; in England, $284.00; in America, $584.00.

Take the highest paid workers, it shows that the possible savings of the family of a locomotive engineer, in Germany are $450.33; in Belgium, $438.00; in France, $516.40; in England, $432.40; in America, $1,334.00; and the possible savings of carpenters, blacksmiths, tinsmiths, etc., etc., range between these extremes, in each of the countries named.

The free traders make two replies to such proof of the better condition of the American wage-workers:

First, that the protective tariff has had no influence in inducing our high industrial development and high wages, and

Secondly, that if it can be proved that it had, it follows that it is at the expense of other peoples, and is therefore immoral.

Believers in the rightfulness and expediency of a protective tariff reply that

If the best interests of man as man, not of any one class, or of any dozen classes of men, but all men; not only in this country, but in all countries, is not benefited by our legislation to secure varied occupations and a high rate of wages to American workmen, securing to them an opportunity to engage in any department of mechanical and agricultural industry adapted to our soil and climate, then we cannot justify it to the enlightened conscience of the christian world.

I do not seek to commend to you for this country any narrow selfish policy.

If those, who believe in what is known as the protective principle in our revenue laws, cannot sustain it on the very highest grounds of morality and religion, then they are ready to abandon it at once.

Show us from the actual conditions in any nation, acting upon any other principles or practices, any higher moral or physical results than those wrought here, and we want no more of the protective policy.

We believe, that the protectionist theory and practice is in harmony with the highest moral principles ever proclaimed to man.

We are sustained in our position by every consideration acted upon by christian gentlemen, from the beginning until now.

When the free trader questions our position as political economists we reply, that it is justified and supported by the practices of every christian family and nation on the face of the globe.

When he assails our position as moralists and accuses us of selfishly seeking the advancement of our country at the expense

of other peoples or nations, we reply that we are acting upon those precepts of morality and practices of religion, enunciated and lived by Jesus of Nazareth, and by the most honest seekers after the Unknown God the world has ever known.

Jesus taught, that the greatest service any man could do the world was to first cleanse his own life and character.

To make the very most of one's self, morally, intellectually, physically, and in power, wealth and station, from high motives and for beneficent purposes, is man's first duty, so that in doing so, he does not hinder any other man in the doing of the same for himself.

No man can accomplish anything for his fellows without first considering himself. Neither can he accomplish it for himself without lifting up, by simple attrition, his fellow-men.

Then comes his family, then his neighborhood, his town, his country; and after, not before, the world; else there is no place for filial affection, and patriotism is an empty name.

"He that provides not for his own household . . . is worse than an infidel," said a great teacher. Christ's command to his disciples was, go preach the gospel among all nations, "*beginning at Jerusalem.*"

According to our free trade friends, God should not have taken one nation, that through their first and exclusive religious and economic training all the world, through their example, might be elevated.

Never has the slightest good been done by a man or nation by simple teaching.

It is said, "Good rarely comes of good advice." It never so comes. All truths must be first incarnated, then the man or nation may speak, and not before. The teaching, the help to our fellows, comes of being the thing we teach.

So taught our great teacher eighteen hundred years ago. Was He partial and exclusive, wanting in broad-mindedness and wisdom, when he chose twelve men for his constant, daily companions, that he might more perfectly instruct them, in his daily contact with them, that through them he might lift up all men. It is the order of human progress that one man precede all other men, and pull up only the very few of his

fellows. They being up, pull up, not boost from beneath, still more, and they many more, and so on. First the man, then his own people, and then the world.

Upon the free trade plan of progress, Christ ought to have had, as companions and near friends, every man of Palestine in rotation, and no second visit to the Bethany family, he so dearly loved, should have been made, until every other family in Judea had been visited. There must be some mistake in the whole Bible records, from the calling of Abraham to the salvation of President Seelye. Having climbed into the realm of Christian Theosophy, hear how President Seelye in the *Forum* for March, misrepresents the position of Protectionists, and objects to their plan of elevating our race by first making the very most of our own nation:

"The organic unity of the race, which makes men everywhere fellow-members one of another, and by which it is impossible for one man or nation to find permanent benefit in what will not also inure to the advantage of all mankind, forbids any permanent attempt on our part to secure our independence by isolation. Arbitrary restraints upon trade, in the effort to build up our own independence at the expense of that of other nations, are foreign to the truly American instinct."

No more unfair statement could well have been made, than to say that Protectionists seek "to build up our own independence at the expense of other nations" or "to secure our independence by isolation."

Can President Seelye tell us how our moral, intellectual or material growth has been "at the expense of other nations?"

Can he point out how this nation could be any more helpful to the suffering peoples of Europe than it has been, or as much so, were it any less in industrial development, in intelligence, in wealth, or in its power of numbers?

Can any man conceive, how this nation could have done any more to elucidate and make practical the great truth of the "organic unity of the race," than it has done, in its form of government, in its equal laws, in its hospitality, in its diplomacy, in its moral and physical development — in its simply being, what it is?

"And having done all, to stand," is the scriptural injunction. Standing in the simple grandeur of her achievements, she is

the beacon, the hope, the helper of every thoughtful sufferer from tyranny the world over.

Only moral power and influence of individuals or nations, is enduring, and that lies in what they are, and what they are, is largely the result of and is made manifest in what they do.

It is not conceivable that this nation could have rendered any greater service to the other nations of the earth, than she has rendered by steadily securing her own development *with no hurt to them.*

All human experience teaches that, what we see and know of her honor and glory would not have been but for the wisdom of the fathers, which has continued until now, nearly every one of whom saw in the protective tariff the possibility of rapid industrial development, and through it our hope of national greatness, and having achieved what they prophesied, and in the way they pointed out, to an extent that seems almost miraculous, who has a right to say any other way would have been, or is now, a better way?

Again, a protective tariff is not an "arbitrary restraint upon trade."

As well say a bit and bridle by which we guide, control and develop to our use the power of the horse, is an arbitrary restriction on travel.

In all normal conditions, the trade of a country, internal and external, is in proportion to the manufactures, in that country.

We exported a smaller proportion of our productions when we were 6,000,000 of people, all agriculturists, than we now do with 60,000,000 of people, highly developed in mechanical skill.

Our ability to buy and our purchases, have increased abroad instead of trade being arbitrarily restricted.

Of articles on the free list, the importation has increased from $29,000,000, seven hundred per centum in twenty years, to $223,000,000 in 1887, and of goods paying duties, from $329,000,000 to $450,000,000.

In 1867 there were collected on imports $164,000,000, and in 1887, $214,000,000.

And our internal trade, which the free trader never knows of, has increased many, many fold in the same time, which in all countries is also in proportion to its manufactures.

On every article of manufacture, or product of the soil that is adapted to our soil and climate, protectionists insist on a tariff that shall be equivalent to the difference in wages where they are produced and of the wages here, for the number of days' work there is in it; to the end of securing to every citizen of this country the possibility of his doing in this country that thing, for the doing of which he is by birth or education best fitted to do, and to secure to him the possibility of his exchanging the product of his labor on equal terms, for the product of the labor of his fellow-workers in this country.

That is to say: our government compels every European manufacturer to pay into the treasury of the United States all the money he has saved by not paying his workmen as much as American workmen receive, before he is allowed to sell his goods in this country.

This is the protectionist's idea of obeying the Golden Rule: Seeing to it that every citizen of this country has a fair chance to do, and fair pay for doing, the thing he can best do.

Not to *restrict trade* but to *promote trade*. What good is Cobden's cheap loaf in the shop window to a man with no opportunity to earn its price?

The trade of England with this country is to-day many times larger than it could possibly be but for our developed industries, which largely, in fact mostly, come of the tariff.

Trade is possible only in proportion to the effectiveness of each day's work done, and the effectiveness of work done depends upon the skill and intelligence of the worker, and, other things being equal, the intelligence and skill of the worker depends upon the number of things he sees done and is himself familiar with the doing of.

So a nation is great, rich, powerful and intelligent, in proportion to the things its people can do, and their skill in doing them.

To despise or underrate material progress is the wisdom of fools.

What a power for good this great, rich, powerful country is, and what an object lesson it is to every looker-on in Europe, to commend free government.

How significant that the wealth of this once-despised democracy has increased from $16,000,000,000 in 1860 to $44,000,000,000 in 1880.

Development in every department of knowledge grows out of, and is supported by, material development. To make men, the men must make things, and the more things the greater men.

All thoughtful men know that the principle of free trade is sound, and ought to be acted upon, as far as social conditions will admit of, and they also know that every man has a natural and "inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and as far as possible, consistent with public safety, it ought not to be abridged.

Shall we therefore repeal our laws sustaining the police force, abolish our courts and tear down our jails, because of our theories regarding personal liberty? That would be just as sensible as to abolish all protective duties on imported goods, costing just as many days' work where made as they cost in days' work here; the days' work there costing half the wages, by reason of hard social conditions, that they would cost here, in far happier surroundings, because of a theory of free trade.

No man is qualified to rightly legislate on revenue laws, who has not read and thought far enough to know that free trade is theoretically correct. Neither should any man receive our votes, who does not know that, like mathematics to mechanics, it requires much modification in practical life.

We want no man in Congress who, under the guise of improving our strong citadel, will dig down its foundations. Four years ago, in party platform and speech, this question seemed settled. To-day the issue is squarely made, and all other questions must stand aside, so that we may keep faith with and protect the homes of the wage-workers of America.

Some of the most conscientious, reliable, and liberal constituent members and supporters of the republican party and thorough protectionists, felt compelled to withhold from it their support, in 1884, but every one of them will be found working and voting for the republican electors in 1888.

The free trade republicans have long since found shelter in the folds of the democratic party.

We honor college professors and theorists, for teaching what they believe to be true, thus honestly earning the income of the funds made possible because of a protective tariff, to be given by the men who contributed them for their support, but for them to assume that the opinion and experience of the great captains of industry, whose grasp of great and fundamental principles, touching things with which they are familiar, is quite equal to their own, is of no value in settling great industrial problems, of which the professor has no practical knowledge, is not gratifying to our self respect, or creditable to them. While much that is taught by the professor of that so-called science, common men know to be true, they also know that very much that the professors pretend to certainly know is not true.

What can be more opposed to actual facts than their teachings concerning distinct rent, interest and profit, when each stands for all; about the wage-fund, the laws of production and distribution, and much more nonsense, not excepting free trade, for us to-day?

What cursing of the prattling image of God in its mother's arms is the horrible teaching of Malthus. I prefer the words, "Suffer little children to come unto me."

It is popularly supposed that experience has some value.

Would it not be more becoming in these theorists to suppose that men who had been in close and successful competition with manufacturers of kindred things all their lives, would actually know beyond peradventure, how the removal of our tariff would affect the wages of their employees, who in many cases are their near friends and companions? Free traders have such a contempt for facts, experience and the opinions of manufacturers, that they protest against the inductive method and declare only the deductive is of any value. That is to say, facts are of no value. Suppositions thus rule in their science, not truth.

What Yale, Harvard, Professor Summer and Professor Perry *think*, is more of value than what any manufacturer *knows*.

Senator Morgan, of Alabama, says that:

"The *bounty* called protection has been given to capital employed in manufactures diverting money into the pockets of favored classes is tyranny assisted by treachery."

The hard words "Tyranny assisted by treachery," are common upon the tongues of our tariff reform friends and counselors.

Let us examine this "tyranny assisted by treachery."

We know that the protective tariff is not in the interest, especially, of the manufacturer. We know that its benefit is to increase the pay of the wage-worker. This is proved by the fact that the manufacturers of England make more money, have larger capital, and are in every way better circumstanced as capitalists than are the American manufacturers.

We know that the operatives in England receive, taking men, women and children, scarcely more than half as much wages as they receive in this country. We know by the same means that we know any fact touching our competition with each other, that nothing keeps wages here much above English wages but the tariff.

We know that, with scarcely an exception, our manufacturers were trained in our factories and from journeymen rose to be manufacturers. We know that they are now leaders in civilization, and not sordid and mean, but stewards of great affairs in the interest of every man in the land.

We know that in all places the man who is designated by his fellow workmen as a leader, by the respect and deference he wins from them by his character and skill in his business is made foreman in his department. His executive ability there, securing for him the leadership over the foremen of other departments, he is made general superintendent, and finally becomes a manufacturer himself, in competition with his former employers. From the suffrages of his fellow citizens in the form of their purchasing his products, rather than those of other manufacturers, he is able to continue his business. If he serves his fellows with more skill than other manufacturers he continues and they fail. If not he fails and goes back to the loom or the bench, and usually his grand-children are found where he began.

We are not conscious of being "bribed" or of being influenced above our fellows by "cupidity," or are "dishonorable" or "slothful," or that we prosper by "dishonor assisted by treachery."

The number of manufacturing industries and manufactories are increased in this country by the tariff, and there its effect ends. No men or set of men profit by it above their fellows: I have given the simple story of the beginning and continuance of nearly every factory in this country, great or small. But what do the free traders, alias tariff reformers, say to us? Couched in finer or coarser phrase, they tell us we are robbers and gamblers. Senator Morgan says:

"We set out wisely, I admit, in our constitution to encourage useful inventions and discoveries by guaranteeing exclusive privileges to inventors. It was plain then as it is now, that the monopoly of inventors would be a heavy and continuous tax on producers. The farmer lives harder and digs harder to enable him to bear the burden."

And all this in full view of the fact, that no class in this country has been any more benefitted by the tariff than the farmer.

Farm wages and profits to farm owners are double in this country what they are in any other, small as they may be.

Every modern machine to alleviate and increase the efficiency of the labor of the farmer originated in this country. The mower, the reaper, the thresher, the tedder, the horse rake, etc., etc., making it possible for us to export our $500,000,000 worth of agricultural products produced at double the wages of European laborers and many times the profit to our farmers.

The tariff made possible the high grade of mechanics competent to invent and make such machines.

Not only every modern machine used in agriculture, but there is not a machine for working hides or leather, for making boots or shoes, or a sewing machine of any kind, for which Europe is not indebted to America.

The whole system of perfect duplication of parts, the greatest advance in manufacturing of modern times, originated in America.

That great, learned, practical and candid man, Chairman Mills of Texas, came up into Rhode Island to find out that the

machines to make seamless stockings were invented and made in this country, and that all European manufacturers of that lovely covering to our pedal extremities, pay royalty to a terrible Yankee.

The very looms upon which many of the finest European fabrics are made, Europe owes to America.

They are the result of the genius and skill of Worcester's mechanics, and to them they are now paying a royalty.

A very large proportion of all improvements in mechanism for the last thirty years are due to American mechanics, who could not have been, but for the tariff which has enabled our people to turn their energies, from being exclusively agricultural, or making only the coarser things of new countries, to manufacturing, thus enabling America at once to come into the *combined advantages of an old country and a new.*

There is not a man familiar with the history of the phenomenal mechanical dovelopment of recent years, who does not know this to be true, that nine-tenths of it should be credited to American mechanics.

They also know that European manufacturers, particularly the English, keep agents in this country whose sole business it is to buy up immediately and ship to Europe every new machine. They eagerly watch our factories, as well as the patent office, and there is not a machine of any kind in an American factory, that is not in the English factory as soon as it can be sent there.

Our manufacturers also know, what I personally know from observation in many European factories, that there is no perceptible difference between the skill and speed with which these American machines are run in Europe in their best factories by European wage-workers and in America.

The brothers and sisters, fathers and sons of the men who run them in Europe are running them in America.

Mechanical invention in every country, without exception, is practical and useful, and it is made in every country in proportion to the money wages of its wage-workers.

In Europe, particularly in Southern Europe, men and women are cheaper as beasts of burden than oxen and asses.

At 30c. a day farmers have no use for plows and oxen. Long rows of men and long rows of women, naturally as agile and deft in the factory as Americans, are seen in large fields, spading up the ground and carrying manure in baskets up the mountain sides.

In high-waged America, is the stimulus to invention, and machinery can be economically used.

If the former cruel laws of England, some of them as late as 1842, restricting the departure from England of skilled workmen, the exportation of machines or models of machines, or drawings of machines, had been upon the United States statute books and had been effectively enforced during the last thirty years, we could before now have driven her manufacturers from every market of the world.

To-day, the Atlantic is no more of a barrier between duplicate factories than was a wide river to our fathers.

England and America, with reference to each other, are like duplicate manufacturing towns, one on each side of a river, having operatives of hardly perceptible difference in intelligence and skill, those on our side having pay rolls for the same volume of product, double that of the other, each now compelled to market their goods in a different place.

It is not conceivable to any but free trade theorists, certainly not to practical manufacturers and wage-workers, how we could freely open our markets to the half-pay factories of England, or enter England's present markets with our goods, except by reducing the pay of American mechanics nearly one-half, and to the English standard of wages.

There are, however, millions of dollars' worth of our goods made in the "duplicate system," or which our high wages allow the taste and habits of Americans to be educated to the use of, that are now largely exported, and a foreign trade of millions might be built up in them, had we subsidized steamship lines to our American neighbors.

Let us take in each country the man at the bottom, that we may realize what high wages mean, to our country. It is a sound maxim in legislation, and I commend it to our free trade citizens, that

"Any legislation that benefits the honest, industrious man at the bottom, benefits the whole community, and any legislation that lessens the pay or in any way adds to the burden of the humblest class of citizens is an injury to the whole country."

In estimating the comparative social conditions of the people of different countries, it is safe to take the condition of the humblest families in them and for those families to find what are the possible savings from their wages in each country.

Furthermore, it will be found that the relative condition of all classes in any country, as compared with other countries, is the same as is that of the humblest people in those countries, provided it is possible for the lowest down to save anything.

There can be no real progress of any people in simply living an animal life.

The progress possible to an individual or people is in the gratification of its tastes and aspirations in things superior to simple food and clothing. The possible savings from wages to improved conditions is the safe measure of estimable qualities; and secondly, the possibility of saving is the stimulus and encouragement to save and to grow in character.

Women in the same factories earn in America about two-thirds the wages of men, and boys half as much.

In Europe women earn about two-fifths as much, and boys one-third as much, as men. In a family of four persons, there will average to be two workers.

Our investigations mentioned in the tables at the beginning come to this result: that wages in the United States for a man and women together are very nearly double those in England, three times as much as in France, more than three and a half times as much as in the rest of Europe, and that their purchasing power, for most things necessary to a family, are the same, and for its total supplies in America, is not five per cent. more than in Europe.

What comfort is it to the wage-worker to tell him that by adopting free trade he can get every dollar's worth of the things he now buys in this country for 95 cents after the tariff is removed, and that where he now receives $1 in wages he will then only get .50. Is he so wanting in intelligence that he will give up .50 in his day's wages to save .05 in the price of what he buys.

What a laborer pays extra in America for the things necessary to his family for a whole year, he can buy with his extra wages in America (over European wages) in two weeks' work.

For the other 50 weeks, he can save half his wages and still furnish the same things to his family that the whole of his wages would buy did he live in Europe.

Why do men leave Europe for America if these things are not substantially true? Do not these wage-workers know as much about their own condition when they were in Europe, and now when they are in America, as these free trade theorists know?

In this country, the wife of a man who earns $600 a year rarely works for wages.

They rightly determine that home is worth more than money and the education of their children more than material things.

Wages in all countries are the divisions of the total products of that country.

Each person in each country has exactly that share of the total products of his country that his wages or income bears to the total wages or income of all the people in that country. As no progress towards a higher civilization can be made, excepting on the surplus of wages over absolute necessities of animal existence, we may conclude, that the actual and proportional condition of our people, is as far above that of other countries as is their possible savings in this country over what they could be in other countries.

How terrible is the condition of the wage-workers in most European countries.

The average possible savings of wage-workers in America are six times as much as in Germany, five times those in Belgium, three times those of France, and nearly twice those of England.

This does not mean that these sums are put into savings banks, houses or lands by American wage-workers, though a very large part of them are, but it means that these surpluses over European possibilities are spent in things that elevate to a far higher plane American mechanics.

All the evidence shows that the tariff is the main cause of this superior condition, shared by all classes of wage-workers

alike, for when wages rise in one group of industries they rise in all, as operatives freely pass from one industry to another.

With eyes closed to all around him, Senator Morgan again says:

"The producers are arrayed on one side of this controversy, under compulsion of self-interest, while all other classes are induced by self-interest or cupidity to take the other side."

Verily, how base or stupid all men, but free traders, are.

When we ask for the teaching of acknowledged facts and for fair arguments, we get abuse. Does he not know that the producers and the consumers are one and the same persons? The condition he describes is the creation of his imagination. Producers cannot be arrayed against consumers. Wage-workers may be arrayed against their immediate employers, to correct some false adjustment of interest, real or imaginary; but to array producer against consumer is as impossible as for a man to have a contest with himself. Even James Russell Lowell is of the same mind and speech as Senator Morgan. He tells us that:

"Never before have such enormous bribes been offered to self-interest, to cupidity, to dishonor, to sloth."

And thus, he also discredits the men whose patient industry, wise legislation and sound knowledge of the laws governing industrial development, has enabled them to provide for such as he, the means of that generous culture which enabled him in days gone by to do valiant service for the slave, and which he now turns upon us in ridicule and disparagement.

"Cupidity, dishonor, sloth," and this among his countrymen and former friends, where no idler is tolerated with patience, where every class and nearly every individual, not a tramp, a drunkard or a criminal works, up to the very limit of his ability.

Verily, he must have thought himself in "Merry England," where it is respectable for men to idly live in what would be thought "dishonor and sloth," in this country, in proclaimed and honored "cupidity," enforced by law, where the laborer works for half American wages.

Says Mr. Lowell:

"Bounties have fallen into discredit now. They have taken an alias and play their three-card trick as subsidies, or as protection to labor." We have protected our shipping interests so effectually that they have ceased to exist."

Our merchant and government navy has ceased to exist, has it?

This is now about the only blot on our national escutcheon, and we have to thank our impracticable free trade theorists for it.

Our people without a navy, are powerful to create happy social conditions, but helpless to protect the thousands from any foreign foe in their enjoyment of them.

All men declare we ought to have a powerful navy, and there is not in the country a single believer in a protective tariff who would not at once vote the money necessary to build one.

They know, however, that government ships must be supported by scores of merchant steamships that could at once be turned into effective gunboats. In order to have them, we must pay for them.

Mr. Lowell is as just, and no more so, in his reference to ships as he is to the protective tariff.

Does he not know that we do not build a navy because free traders such as he are not willing to give an American mechanic a fair day's pay for a fair day's work to build and sail ships.

Practical men know that it is worse than folly to take the gift of a navy, if we have not the appliances to build one.

Are American manufacturers "gamblers and swindlers" because they believe in paying the price necessary to secure an ample navy, built by our own mechanics? No country ever yet built up great steamship lines without subsidies or bounties.

Scarcely one such line sails to-day, from any country, that has not received them, and most are now receiving them. "Playing our three-card monte trick," are we, or attempting to do so, because we propose to build up a navy by the only means, human wisdom has yet discovered by which it can be done.

"Our shipping interests have ceased to exist" by the acts and failure to act of men of like faith and practice with Messrs. Lowell and Morgan. They have blocked every rational effort

to keep our navy alive when we had one, or to restore it since they allowed it to languish. They also ruined, as far as they could, the only man that was left in the country who had the courage, the skill and the capital to revive it.

No nation ever has, or ever can, sail ships that has not the appliances and skill to build them. The keeping in running order, any steam or sailing vessel requires the same appliances that are necessary to build them. Even railways cannot be economically and successfully run, except the corporations build and repair their own engines and cars. These free traders, the blind leaders of the blind, are all falling into the ditch. But then this free trade theory is so fascinating. It's "so English, you know."

Said a free trader, after "pelting" us for nearly an hour with the most glittering generalities, totally oblivious of a single fact:

"Protection is selfishness. Men call us theorists. We pelt you with hard facts. Let me read you from a letter from a friend describing how industries grow in a new community in Arizona."

We pricked up our ears, (free traders always see long ears on protectionists), and listened to his beautiful song for ten minutes, ending up with the "building of a creamery," which was the only "mechanical industry" named.

Then he told us that the recent snow storm, impeding all travel, with hackmen getting $25 a trip, hotel men getting $50 a room, laborers $2 an hour, with the milkman, the butcher, the grocer unable to serve their customers, was the ideal paradise of the protectionists; and yet, said he:

"The protectionist complained of Germany for excluding the American hog. I can conceive of no reason excepting from a fellow feeling."

Then he pelted us with this great economic maxim:

"High wages always means cheap production, and low wages dear production."

Which his use of, indicated he understood very differently from manufacturers. It simply means, that, in any group of men employed in any industry, the men who are most honest, diligent and skillful at that work always command the highest

pay, and at the price they get, are the cheapest men to employ, and that the sluggish and unskillful worker is comparatively dear at his price.

Having heard these words from practical men, free traders recite them to prove that there can be no difference in real wages, and that it makes no difference to manufacturers what wages they are obliged to pay, as high wages mean, under all circumstances, cheap products.

He then surprised us with the question, the answer to which they never dreamed of in their great science,

Why are wages in protected industries lower than in other industries?

We answer, because they are mostly filled, particularly the cotton and woolen, with wage-workers from Europe who have not yet learned better than to submit to semi-European conditions.

Wages always represents average family earnings, and are always what will buy those things the family insists on consuming.

In those industries and neighborhoods, where two or more members of the family average to work, the two workers get in wages what the man gets in industries where only the man works.

Then he asked us, Why are not wages higher in protective France and Germany than in free trade England? For obvious and conclusive reasons, so many and still so complex, that they can barely be hinted at in this paper, but they may be summed up in this statement, viz:

Because wage-workers in France and Germany have had no Magna Charta, nor the fulcrum of a new country of unbounded natural wealth and free land over which to pry.

Because they have not the spirit shown at, or born of Runnymede to use the lever.

Because they have not yet the liberty even to use the lever on any fulcrum.

The tariff is an instrument of leverage which, to be effective, must be used by the wage-workers of the country.

It is like every other law or regulation; it accomplishes

nothing in raising or keeping up wages if the wage worker allows his wages to stay down, if low, or to be forced down, if high. Wages go up only by employers bidding them up, or by wage workers forcing them up. Neither condition has been fulfilled on the continent of Europe, to any great extent

In England they have both been used. On the continent, the inertia of ages of oppression has been continued up to the present time through the incubus of their military systems.

Invention, enterprise, social progress, does not come of one man alone.

Grant and Napoleon were great generals only, because they had many lieutenants animated by a genius and spirit but little inferior to their own.

With the general trend of the national mind toward military exploits for long years, generation after generation, no substantial progress can be made in industrial development.

Brief excursions out from the general trend like our brief war, and like the same to an individual, may stimulate and increase industrial development, but not an all-pervading, constant, steady military oppression.

The French have not the steady, aggresive, pushing, rugged character of the Anglo-Saxon or German.

The German in turn is heavy, sluggish, strong, patient, plodding, accurate, whose political oppression has kept him bound to social antediluvianism, excepting in philosophical research and military science. No European country has had that political or social liberty, or established peace that are conditions precedent to marked industrial progress.

These people have no appreciation of their hard social condition, their low wages.

Like a bird born in its prison house, they sing contentedly in their slavery, and demand and therefore receive nothing better. Even these countries have tried the experiment of materially reducing their protective tariff, or absolute free trade, only to abandon it.

Protective tariffs are now relied upon by every one of them as a fundamental condition of improving the welfare of their wage-workers.

It is not so long since our fathers were villains or slaves. Were what remains of the hard condition of any honest, industrious worker evidence of decay, our plight were indeed sorry; but the worst of them are only living examples of the former universal social condition of wage workers, such as we now see in Europe.

It looks much like cursing the image of God, in this country flowing with milk and honey, to say to a single toiling, half-starved woman or child, I know there is plenty and to spare in our storehouses, but in obedience to college teaching of Political Economy, all the people combined cannot help you to get work, or to get wages sufficient to appease your hunger, or cover your nakedness.

Monopolies, trusts, lockouts, blacklisting and boycotting must go, and there must not be, because there must be no need of organized efforts to enforce just, or unjust demands of wage-workers upon their employers.

These things are conditions of semi-war.

In our government of the people, by the people, and for the people, every willing, honest, frugal worker must be protected by legislation from being obliged to accept any less than a fair day's pay for a fair day's work; to the end, that men may be lifted up, not cast down, thus causing fair distribution as well as cheap production, that consumption may equal production, and no man be compelled to stand idly in the market place.

So long as there is anything in the storehouse that the man now obliged to stand idle, earnestly desires to work for, there is something wrong in our economic practice, which only an extension of the protective principle can remedy.

I believe the remedy is plain, simple, easy and effectual. But little, if any, more legislation is needed.

Massachusetts has now on her statute books the forms of all the laws the remedy requires, and the substance is near; but abolish, or seriously reduce our protective tariff and, with wages so low in Europe, the substance is unattainable.

These theorists, in the name of so-called science, themselves in luxurious comfort, bind heavy burdens, grievous to be borne, for the helpless, the poor and the lowly, and touch them not with their little finger, and forbid others to touch them.

Laws of trade! We build dykes, canals and sluice ways to save ourselves from destruction by the action of natural laws; we resort to fire insurance, life insurance; Odd Fellows, Patrons of Husbandry and a Protective tariff, to protect ourselves from the unrestrained laws of trade.

Every law covering child labor, the compulsory education of children, restricting the hours of female labor, preventing cruelty to children, in fact protecting the ignorant, the weak, and the selfish, from being oppressed or of oppressing others, is an interference with the so-called christian maxims, that are no maxims, called political economy. Free trade comes to this that

"In the fierce struggle of *universal competition*, those whom *climate enables* or *misery* forces, or *slavery compels*, to *live worst*, and *produce cheapest*, will necessarily beat out of the market and *starve* those whose wages are better.

It is a struggle between the working classes of all nations to see which shall descend first and nearest to the condition of the *brutes*."

England, in her political and economic position, is so unlike that of any other people that its example, even had she attained it by free trade, which she has not, is valueless as a guide.

Every wrong principle, or act, is but the carrying too far, or the perversion of the right.

No people, so far as we know, ever carried the principle of a protective tariff to such a wicked extreme, or so cruelly oppressed all nations in her power in the interests of her manufacturers as has England, until in her peculiar situation she had secured an impregnable industrial position.

Manufacturers are now living and in business in this country, whose fathers, because of their being skilled artizans, run the risk under the English law of being fined and imprisoned for leaving England.

I commend to every man, who does not thoroughly know English industrial history, James M. Swank's American Iron Trade report of January 1, 1876. It is reserved to the American free trader to declare that wages would not be reduced or our industries crippled by a reduction of the tariff or by absolute free trade.

Every English manufacturer knows they would be, and scarcely an English writer or visitor but so declares, and also that they ought to be, and that our place is that of an agricultural people, and that it is unjust to England, for America to adopt any legislative means to secure her own industrial development.

Candid English political economists admit this to be their position, and claim that England is of right the workshop of the world, and that America should content herself mainly with agricultural pursuits; that it is in some sense or in some way infringing upon her rights for America to enter upon manufacturing industries.

Harper & Bro's. edition of Professor J. E. Carnes' Political Economy, on page 384, the writer says: "In the United States the rate of wages is *high*, whether *measured in* gold or in the most *important articles of the laborer's consumption*. On the other hand, the rate of wages in Europe, *measured by the same standards*, are, *at least as compared with rates in the United States, low.*" On page 386 we have the following: "I beg the reader to consider what is meant by the alleged 'inability' of New England and Pennsylvania to compete, let us say, with Manchester and Sheffield in the manufacture of calico and cutlery. What it means, and *what it only means*, is that they are unable to do so *consistently with obtaining that rate of remuneration on their industry which is current in the United States.*" On page 387 I read as follows: "Engaging in the branches of industry in which their advantage over Europe is great, they reap industrial returns proportionately great; and so long as they *confine themselves to these occupations*, they can compete in the neutral markets of all the world, and still secure the high rewards accruing from their exceptional resources. * * * * But they *must descend into the arena with Sheffield and Manchester, and yet secure* the rewards of Chicago and St. Louis.

Such admissions concerning wages, made by them, shows conclusively that the adoption of free trade or the material reduction of the tariff would result in transfering thousands of laborers from mechanical to agricultural pursuits, over-crowding the market, reducing their price enormously, and reducing the pay of every wage-worker in America.

The aim of the protectionist is to keep wages at a high standard of America, and by that means secure a more equal division of the products of industry the world over, as it has thus far done.

Free trade writers are compelled to acknowledge that free trade is a necessity to a nation of slaveholders, because slavery is not compatible with industrial development, but it is necessary to, and the measure of, intellectual progress.

For English writers to insist on free trade for the United States clearly reveals, that it is *trade* and not *truth* that sways the English mind.

How free trade would affect the home of each one of us may be seen by taking Worcester for an example.

By careful estimate, I find in the manufacturers of small fire-arms that in the finest six-barrelled revolver the material costs 30 cents, labor $3.20 and the expense (which should be counted in these estimates with labor) is $1.05, and in a fire-arms factory producing $200,000 worth of goods of various kinds per year, the stock only cost $8,000, while labor and expense account is $192,000.

In a first-class shop for manufacturing machinists' tools, doing $200,000 business a year, the stock would be only $66,000, and the labor and expense account $134,000.

In 100 pairs of common cheap long-legged split boots, the leather is $105, and the labor and expense $40.

In each 100 pairs of men's fine shoes the leather cost $122; the labor, findings and expense account $104.

In the one city of Worcester, with only 80,000 people, the pay roll under free trade must be reduced by over $4,000,000 per annum.

This means a reduction of the power of the operatives to buy and consume manufactured goods of nearly the same sum, even at free trade prices.

As no one has yet devised any way of increasing consumption among a people, excepting by increasing the wages paid to that people, will some free trader figure out how great the disasters would be, that would result from reducing wages in this country by even 25%.

Were wages, from to-morrow morning, increased for our cheapest honest workers, the lowest down to $1.50 a day for men, and for women to $1.00 a day, and for boys and girls 67 cents a day (who board themselves), our storehouses would be emptied at once, and a period of prosperity would be seen such as no country ever experienced.

All the energies of our mechanics and thinkers have heretofore been concentrated on production.

When our skill in securing prompt consumption, is equal to our success in production, a higher social condition will be realized than man has ever conceived, and this can only be realized by increasing wages to reduce wages is going back towards barbarism.

A dead line of wages is being fast established in America, below which, they will not be allowed to go.

To increase wages, not to decrease them, is for the interest of merchants, manufacturers and wage-workers alike. With wages so low in Europe this cannot be done unless we keep the protective tariff.

In America, as we know from observation and experience the wage-worker with youth, health, industry, frugality, fair ability, high hope and determination, may win the richest prizes of the land.

What wise man will abandon this proved and certain good condition for a promised paradise, only visible to theorists and dreamers?

Appendix.

Free traders are sure, times of business depression are more frequent in America, which is not the fact, and furthermore, they are more severe in England than in this country. The higher the wages, in any country, the less the people suffer in such periods.

While times of "panic," "partial cessation in manufacturing" and "general depreciation of money value of all property," is hard for wage-workers, manufacturers, capitalists — all men alike — to bear, and while they cause more suffering to wage-workers as a class than to any other class, yet it is a fact, that

there are no periods of time so brief, that so certainly and suddenly lift the wage-worker to a higher plane. In the misery of the brief time covered by them they evolve the greatest blessing to the wage-worker.

Their proper description is to say, that at such times, the whole mass of the capital of the country becomes a common fund, a very large part of which is distributed, pro rata, for the benefit of the people. After such distribution, persons who had it at the beginning of the panic, are allowed to keep what has not been taken from their particular contribution to the fund for the benefit of the mass of the people.

In a "panic" nothing is lost, nothing is destroyed; exactly the same things remain and their intrinsic value is exactly the same, but the "panic" reduced the money valuation of real estate and securities by many billions.

In a "panic," and immediately following, a very large proportion of the property in the country, excepting real estate, changes hands, and the new investors and those not selling, then value all their holdings and demand an income thereon at the prices any portion has sold for in the market.

This process reduces the share taken from the wage-worker by capital, by very nearly the proportion that the new valuation of the total property in the country is less than its total valuation before the "panic."

That is to say, the receivers of rents, of interest and of dividends demand and are as well satisfied with the same per cent. of income on the lower valuation of precisely the same property (and frequently even a less per cent.) than they received on its higher valuation.

As precisely the same things exist, in their integrity, after a "panic" as before, and are used in precisely the same way in satisfying the wants of the people as before, the difference in the total sum received for interest, rent or dividends on all the capital in the country, is absolutely saved to the wage-workers of the country.

While the titles to no more property are in the names of the wage-working class, the "panic" has precisely the same practical effect on their welfare as would result from investing for their benefit a sum equal to the difference in the money valua-

tion of the total capital in the country before the "panic" and after it, and using the income thereof in paying a part of the freight on all things transported for their benefit, a part of their rents, in fact a part of the price of all the things used by them.

This is fairly illustrated by a railway, which before the panic was valued at $100,000,000, and its shareholders received 5% interest on that valuation — $5,000,000.

The "panic" compelled many of its shoreholders to sell at twenty cents on the dollar, and that price or valuation is accepted by old and new holders of its shares. Its total valuation in the minds of its shareholders is then $20,000,000, instead of $100,000,000.

The "panic" compelled it to reduce the price on its service, as it does the valuation of its shares.

The then owners of its shares are as well satisfied with 5% dividends, amounting to $1,000,000 on its lesser valuation as the older stockholders were with 5%, amounting to $5,000,000, on its inflated valuation.

The saving of $4,000,000 annually goes for the benefit of every person interested in the service rendered by the railroad.

So of the new and lesser valuation, and therefore cheaper service by all the capital in the country, showing in the less price paid by the consumer. The only statement that can be made questioning the correctness of this theory, is that in a "panic" the wages of labor are also reduced.

To this we answer, that the record of wages covering one hundred years shows that wages have steadily advanced, and that any reductions made in the crisis of a "panic" are so soon recovered by wage-workers that it is hardly noticeable in the wage records.

Panics, or financial crises or depressions, are as inevitable as thunder-storms or earthquakes, but in no country are financial crises so easily endured, nor do they cover so brief a period as in this country, and in no country do the wage-workers proportionally suffer so little at such times.